

*The*  
VISION  
OF THE  
EVENING AND THE MORNING

A Study of the Prophecy of  
Daniel VIII.

BY  
JOHN KOLVOORD  
AND  
MOSES E. KELLOGG

---

“And the vision of the evening and the morning which  
was told is true.”—*Daniel viii. 26.*

---

BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN



# THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL VIII

BY JOHN KOLVOORD

## PART I

EVERY true prediction eventually becomes a historic reality. This statement is self-evident to all who know that prophecy differs from history only in point of time: the one is written before, while the other is written after, the events have transpired. For this reason predicted history, taken in its strictest sense, is not a counterpart of prophecy in its being similar to it as a whole, or in bearing resemblance in some important respect. The relation between them does not consist in correspondence or similarity, but in actual identity as to outlines and particular details. Such history is as much a duplicate of prophecy as a carbon copy corresponds with its typewritten upper sheet. To all intents and purposes, this duplicate corresponds with the original, contains the same provisions, and is governed by the same restrictions.

The Messiah delineated by the ancient seers answers exactly to the historical Saviour of apostolic times. Of this proof Jesus availed himself to convince his despairing disciples. The record says, "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Reviewing the various incidents of his history, he pointed out how each had been minutely foretold. The disciples accordingly,



from that time on, saw the identity between the minutest details of his life in prophecy and in history. Thenceforward they read the fulfilment of events in "that which was spoken by the prophets." And for this reason the gospels abound in such utterances as these: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken;" "and the scripture was fulfilled, which saith;" "these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled;" "and again another scripture saith," etc.

Agreeable to this principle, all the data, taken collectively, constitute the full outline of a particular prophècy. Perhaps a few of its delineations may very appropriately be applied to other events, just as a few random strokes may serve as the general outline for many a portrait. But when the artist develops his sketch by bringing out the peculiar and characteristic delineations, it is only then that the sketch assumes individuality. And even at that stage a stroke added here, or a very little change made there, transforms the subject into an entirely different personality.

These principles should be borne in mind when attempting to explain prophecy; for a failure to comply with this requirement results inevitably in misapplication. Absolute identification should be sought. And having succeeded in proving the identity of the outlines of a given prophecy with the salient features of a historic personality or event, we shall then have found both the original and its duplicate. The one will fit the other as exactly as a casting fits its mold.



Having briefly outlined the principle on which we planned to conduct the investigation, we commence, without further preliminaries, to test the correctness of an accepted interpretation of the sanctuary and the 2,300 days of Dan. 8:13, 14. This study being, in the first place, a test of the quite widely accepted explanation, will have to be prosecuted along two lines—the one negatively and the other constructively. We do not intend to take away without giving something better instead. To this the unbiased reader, who desires truth above anything else, can have no objection. Error may be fondled, may be regarded invulnerable to sound criticism, yea, may be defended to the last ditch, yet truth, though crushed to earth, will rise again; “the eternal years of God are hers.”

In the symbolic representation of Daniel 8, a ram and a he-goat served respectively as representatives of the Medo-Persian and the Grecian empires. Now, note well that each animal symbolizes a government, but the horns convey different ideas. Those of the ram suggest that the government is a double power composed of the union of two kingdoms. Yet the two form but one empire represented by the ram. Grecia, another empire, has a notable horn, and that horn also does not represent the empire, but Greece's first king only; for the shaggy goat itself was explained to represent the “king” (kingdom) of Greece. Verse 21.

Similarly in Daniel 7, the nondescript beast is pictured as having ten horns. The animal is interpreted

to be a portrait of the third universal kingdom, after Babylon. In verse 24, "the ten horns out of this kingdom" are said to be "ten kings that shall arise." Hence, when Rome was finally divided, the resulting kingdoms perpetuating Roman civilization, language, and laws, were Roman still. And the little horn, coming up among the ten, though diverse from them all, is Romish notwithstanding. All this follows logically, because the beast wearing the horns represents Rome.

The principal question to be settled first is the meaning of the animal. The horns are secondary symbols, representing either the supreme authority of a single monarch, or the kingdoms resulting from the division of the empire. In the case under consideration, the "kingdom" of Greece had a notable horn, which was plainly explained to represent a single king. After his death, the unity of the monarchy was broken into four divisions, as is represented by the four horns. And each of those four horns represents a kingdom over which a dynasty, or a succession of kings, bore rule. Their political nationality is determined by the animal bearing the horns. Relying upon the soundness of this premise, we predicate that the horns of a ram are ram's horns; the horns of a goat are goat's horns; and the horns of a Roman beast are Roman horns. In the symbolism of Scripture we do not find the anomaly of a Roman horn growing out of a goat's horn. Yet we are asked to believe that the little horn, which sprang out of one



of the horns of the he-goat, was <sup>the</sup> then Roman power!

Illustrating the basic principles enunciated, the following corroborative testimony, we think, will settle the question conclusively. In the preceding chapter, the Grecian empire is not represented by a goat with four horns, but by a winged leopard having four heads. Beginning at this point, the symbols represent an absolute identity: the horns and the heads denote the four divisions of the empire. By parity of reasoning, let us now assume that something grew out of one of those heads, just as the little horn came forth out of one of the horns. Would not the bone, flesh, or horn growing out of the head be regarded as a part of the animal, inasmuch as the leopard's blood caused it to grow? Would any sane person, seeing such an outgrowth, think of calling it the beginning of another animal? Could the thing grow, if severed from the head? Or could the thing live and grow after the leopard died? These questions are easily answered; likewise as regards the little horn. It could grow only so long as the goat's blood furnished the increment. The goat could fight with it, but it could not fight against the goat and overcome him. If it was a formidable horn, it was that on account of the strength of the goat pushing it. To believe the opposite is to believe a palpable absurdity. Yet such an absurdity is advocated by those who teach that the horn (Rome) conquered the beast (Greece) out of which it came forth.

Neither was the Roman empire a continuation of



the universal dominion established by Alexander, which it would have been had it sprung from the Macedonian horn. Rome existed, as an independent power, long before the Grecian empire wielded its sway over the Orient. There is just as good reason for claiming that the Grecian dominion came in through Medo-Persia, and the Medo-Persian through Babylon, as there is for Rome coming in through the Macedonian horn. When Rome had subjugated the Macedonian kingdom, the he-goat had one horn broken off, but he still lived and fought with three horns. And if Rome was a part of that lost horn, then the empire lost both the horn and the little one coming out of it. Logically then, Greece rid herself of Rome when she lost Macedonia. Thus their argument contradicts itself.

In each panoramic representation of prophecy, the vanishing governments are succeeded either by different animals or by different metals. We challenge a single instance where a distinctly foreign power is represented as issuing out of any part of a vanquished beast. It is, therefore, anomalous and absurd to attribute to Rome what distinctly belongs to one of the horns of Greece.

The theory assailed also runs counter to the plain specifications enumerated in the prophecy. There is no intimation of one of the four horns being destroyed by the little horn. According to a positive declaration of the one who was commissioned to explain the prophecy, the four horns represented the

four kingdoms into which the Greek dominion would be divided. Verse 22. The nation continues to be the goat nation, for from this time on a four-horned goat serves as symbol. While the goat had one horn, the executive authority was vested in one king. This idea is plainly expressed in these words: "And the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king." Verse 21. After its division, the empire was ruled by four contemporaneous kings. And as the kingdoms outlasted the lives of several sovereigns, a succession of kings ruled over each. Accordingly, "in the latter time of their kingdom"—*i. e.*, in the latter part of the rule of those four contemporaneous dynasties—"a king . . . shall stand up." Verse 23. The little horn was thus plainly explained to represent *a king*. The horn out of which it sprang typified the whole line of kings, and also, by metonymy, their kingdom. The little one which was seen issuing from the large horn was one of the kings composing the dynasty. Differently expressed, the horn together with its outgrowth constituted the kingdom, or line of kings. The little horn denoted one king of that line, the rest of the dynasty being represented by the large horn. Horn and little horn were a unit, and not two horns. This horn had a process, prong, or branch.

As everything depends upon the soundness of the premise, let us make assurance doubly sure by looking at this matter from still another point of view. The eleventh of Daniel contains a fuller and plainer explanation of the symbols of chapter eight. After



Cyrus, thus said the angel, four more kings would rule over Medo-Persia. The last and richest king would "stir up all against the realm of Grecia," but be beaten by a mighty king. The kingdom of this mighty conqueror was next to be broken, and divided "toward the four winds of heaven." The government, it is also explicitly stated, should not descend to his posterity, seeing it was to be given "to others than those." This interpretation is exactly in harmony with the visions of the four heads and the four horns. Next notice that the subsequent part of the explanation drops two of the four kingdoms and proceeds to tell very minutely what was done by "the king of the north" and "the king of the south." The word *king*, as here used, covers the whole line of Ptolemies on the one hand, and the Seleucid dynasty on the other. But the Macedonian kingdom is not even mentioned, which omission is a significant fact, if it be true that the little horn made its entrance through Macedonia, as has been assumed, and that the Macedonian horn, therefore, constitutes the pivotal idea of the prophecy.

Following this line of investigation a little farther, we find exactly the same things imputed to one of the kings of the north which were charged against the little horn. The king who is called "a vile person," in verse 21, should come in contact with the people of God, pollute the sanctuary, take away the daily sacrifice, and place the abomination of desolation. These specifications agree wholly with those of the little horn. From which facts no other conclusion



can legitimately be drawn than that the little horn constituted a part of the Seleucid horn of the goat. As was affirmed before, it also proves the unity of the horn and the little horn, for the "vile" king comes in the regular succession of the Seleucid kings. He was in no other sense, than in his special deeds, distinct from them. He made himself conspicuous by his attitude and his actions, wherefore he is represented as an awry-grown part of the horn. In no better way could the attention be drawn to his outrageous deeds.

Having proved that the little horn could not possibly come in by way of the Macedonian horn, the inconsistency of the theory can now be further laid bare by instituting an inquiry into what it was to do, when that would be done, how much time was allotted to the performance, besides who and what suffered in consequence. There is as gross a misapprehension, or rather misapplication, of these prophetic specifications as there is of the fundamental meaning of the symbol. The erroneous interpretation of the symbol led to a forced and unnatural explanation of what was done. Let us apply the specifications to Rome, and note the incompatibilities.

The little horn was to tread the sanctuary and the host under foot, during a period of 2,300 days. Assuming the days to represent as many years, the end of the time of oppression can definitely be determined by a simple arithmetical calculation; for, according to the specification of the prophecy, the little horn

does it without assistance. Being therefore restricted by this consideration, the period of 2,300 years can not begin prior to the year 161 B. C., when Rome first came in contact with the people of God. Hence the 2,300 years, though crowded back to their utmost limit (161 B. C.), will not expire before the year 2139 A. D. And that spoils the theory.

Furthermore, the little horn was to tread under foot *both* the host and the sanctuary. Harmonious with this specification, it will be impossible to prove that Rome did, and yet will, oppress either Jews or Christians until the allotted time is full. And as regards the treading under foot of a sanctuary that does not now exist, this problem is beyond comprehension. But an expedient to circumvent this embarrassing difficulty has been sagaciously invented. Elder J. N. Andrews stated the matter thus: "The fact is plain, then, that of the vision of 2,300 days concerning the sanctuary, only 490 pertained to the earthly sanctuary; and also that the iniquity of the Jewish people would in that period be so far filled up that God would leave them, and the city and the sanctuary would soon after be destroyed, and never be rebuilt, but left in ruins till the consummation. . . . It is therefore an established fact that the worldly sanctuary of the first covenant, and the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant, are both embraced in the vision of the 2,300 days."—*The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days.*

In accordance with the aforesaid view, the tread-



ing under foot of the earthly sanctuary began in the year 457 B. C.; *but it is not explained how the little horn could begin its work 296 years before it even came in contact with the Jews.* Or if we are asked to believe that the Persians commenced the atrocious deed in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, then we inquire how the theory can be harmonized with the following decree of Darius, and endorsed by Artaxerxes, in which it is said, “And the God that caused his name to dwell there destroy all kings and people, that shall put to their hand *to alter and to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem.*” As a matter of fact, neither Persians, Grecians, nor Romans caused Israel very much molestation in their belief or worship. Neither did any of them bear a grudge in particular against the sanctuary. This point will become plainer as we proceed.

Notwithstanding, let the assumption be admitted that the sanctuary was defiled for 490 years; on the ground of what specification in the prophecy, then, are we permitted to conclude, that the treading under foot applies to two sanctuaries, the one earthly and the other heavenly? And since the heavenly one was not trodden literally under foot, how can one be answered who insists that the Jewish sanctuary was likewise trodden figuratively under foot by the gentiles? Moreover, since the figurative treading under foot applies to *both* the people and the sanctuary, prove it, who can, that the people suffered hardship. Inflict a figurative punishment upon the people—“but



that would hurt nobody!" Exactly. Neither can a figurative treading under foot affect an earthly or a heavenly sanctuary. Either is desecrated only by actual contact, or by having sins transferred to it. But transferring sins is not treading the sanctuary under foot. If it were, then the 2,300 days would date back to the days of wandering in the wilderness. The sanctuary alluded to in the prophecy had to be cleansed from being defiled by something called an abomination, as well as from having been trampled under foot. Thus it is plainly specified.

Taking it again on the believed premise, another important consideration is overlooked. During the 490 years Israel's sanctuary was cleansed annually, with but three exceptions. As ceremonial performances, those sanctifications were as really effective as any others made previous to the period of seventy weeks. By those acts the sanctuary was hallowed from uncleanness (Leviticus 16). Whoever reflects upon this will perceive, that neither real nor fancied defilement from any source can be imputed to a sanctuary which has been cleansed. To claim sanctification for a sanctuary still reeking with defilement from any other than Israel's sins, is as contradictory as it is inane. Up to the last atonement preceding the rending of the vail, the sanctuary stood cleansed from any and all uncleanness.

We quote again: "The fact is plain, then, that of the vision of 2,300 days concerning the sanctuary, only 490 pertained to the earthly sanctuary."—J. N.

*Andrews.* The fact is still plainer that the temple, being annually purified, no further uncleanness can be imputed to it. Hence the argument does not apply to 490 of the 2,300 years.

The theory respecting the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is equally inconsistent with the requirements of the type. For, while the high priest performed the cleansing work, no one was permitted to enter the temple. Lev. 16:17. During that interim there were no sacrifices for sins. Accordingly, the more satisfactorily it is proved to one's liking that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began in 1844, so much the more positively the end of probation is fixed on that date. If Christ then began his change of ministration from priest to highpriest, confession of sins has ever since been in vain. But the thousands who have received forgiveness during the last sixty years, constitute as many separate proofs that the cleansing work has not yet begun. The time is still future when no one will be able, like in the type, to enter the heavenly sanctuary, for that will be after the seven angels have received the vials full of God's wrath. Rev. 15:5-8. Hence, 1844 fails to connect with the time of cleansing. It is separated by an ever-widening chasm of already more than six decades. Prophecy is not fulfilled so discrepantly. If events do not synchronize exactly with the chronology of the prophecy, there is assuredly no connection between them.

Furthermore, there are alleged to be "two oppos-



ing sanctuaries in Daniel 8. To the careful reader this fact will at once appear. They are as follows: First, the sanctuary of the daily desolation. Second, the sanctuary which the daily and the transgression of desolation were to tread under foot. The one is the sanctuary of Satan; the other is the sanctuary of the Lord of hosts."—*Andrews*. Two opposing sanctuaries plus the Jewish one make three sanctuaries. All of them are embodied in a single word! That word *sanctuary* is surely pregnant with meaning, for it is made to cover every degree of worship in heaven above, the earth below, even down to the homage paid to Satan. Whoever discovered those three in one must have been a great discoverer of hidden things.

An elaborate argument is also built upon the literal meaning of the word *determined*. "Seventy weeks," so says the original, "are cut off upon thy people." Very well, take the expression just as it reads. The period was cut off from something. From what? "From the 2,300 days," it is said. The conclusion is gratuitous. The period can just as consistently be cut off from all subsequent time, as from any limited portion. In Job 14: 5 man's days are said to be "determined." Can this expression have no sensible meaning, unless we fancy them as being cut out of some definitely limited period in the sight of God, who sees the end from the beginning, man lives an allotted length of time; his days are determined, or carved out, without reference to any other event. In



the same sense God allotted 490 years, at whose expiration Israel's peculiar relationship came to an end.

In the next place much reliance is placed upon the allegation that the accepted translation of Dan. 8:13 is incorrect. In "Thoughts on Daniel" it is said, "We have proof in verse 13 that *sacrifice* is the wrong word to be supplied in connection with the word *daily*. . . . The idea of sacrifice does not attach to the word at all. . . . Literally, it may be rendered, 'How long the vision [concerning] the continuance and the transgression of desolation?'"

Had the author of the aforesaid criticism been on less than on the most distant of "speaking terms" with the Hebrew language, he would undoubtedly have amended his emendation of the text. The writer of this knows barely enough of that language to cover the simplest rudiments, nevertheless he can, by the help of a lexicon, trace the connection between "continual" and "sacrifice." Therefore, to disprove the assertion that the idea of sacrifice does not at all attach to the word *continual*, we shall let a Hebrew lexicon decide. Turning to the word *tameed*, we copy the following definition in full: "Continuance, *olah tameed* burnt-offering of continuance, *i. e.*, continual or daily burnt-offering, Num. 28:6, so also in apposition *olath tameed*, Num. 28:3; but also without *olath*, *e. g.*, *hottameed wehaysiroo* and they shall put away the constant offering, Dan. 11:31. (2) as adv. continually, ever."—*Davies' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*.

At the institution of the morning and the evening sacrifice, Moses was instructed to offer "two lambs of the first year day by day *continually*." Ex. 29: 38-46. For this reason it is not far-fetched to call the daily sacrifice the offering of continuance. The Jews of later times called the daily sacrifice simply the "daily," just as we are accustomed to such expressions as reading "dailies" when riding on a "daily." Such expressions are linguistic peculiarities. And Bevan, when writing on the linguistic character of Daniel, cites the very point under consideration, as an illustration. He says: "*Hottameed*, Dan. 8:11, 13; 11:31; 12:11. Other Biblical writers call the daily burnt-offering *olah hottameed* (Num. 28:10ff, Neh. 10:34), but in Daniel the simple *hottameed* is used instead—so also in the Mishna (*e. g.*, Ta'aneeth iv. 6)." The Mishna, comprising the "Oral Law," forms a kind of complement to the written law, which it explains and amplifies. This proves how the Jews understood the expression. In the light of such authorities, "the continuance and the transgression of desolation" is to be regarded as a veritable barbarism. It is meaningless and absurd.

But, "the grand principle involved in the interpretation of the 2,300 days of Dan. 8:14 is, that the seventy weeks of Dan. 9:24 are the first 490 days of the 2,300, of the eighth chapter." The crucial test is, then, to be applied at this point. If the logic can be proved to be fallacious, the system, and with it the theory of the sanctuary, must fall. We shall conduct



this investigation first along the illogical lines of reasoning, and afterwards disprove those premises by historical evidence.

The aforementioned "grand principle" is based upon the hypothesis that the period of 2,300 days was not explained to Daniel, in chapter eight. The failure can consist only in not naming its duration, its initial, or its terminal point. The subject under consideration is the taking away of the daily sacrifice, the casting down of the place of the sanctuary, and the treading under foot of sanctuary and host. In reply to the query, as worded in verse 13, and covering the time when said specifications were to become events, the answer was given: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days." This is unequivocal; there can be no mistaking the *length* of the period. And what should happen at its *close*? "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The taking away of the daily sacrifice and the setting up of the abomination constitute, then, the *beginning* of the period. This is simple enough for an ordinary child to grasp. Time is not the item that could have perplexed Daniel.

Chapters 10 and 11 are devoted to a plainer and more detailed explanation of the vision. According to verse 14, the angel said, "Now am I come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days." The Jews are here named "thy people." In chapter 9 it is likewise said, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people." The vision, then, deals with what

would befall *Israel* in the "latter days." This expression, and also "the time of the end," does not mean the end of time. It is a prophetic phrase denoting the time of fulfilment. It is what the prophet sees at the horizon of his vision. Similarly, Jacob foretold what would happen to his posterity "in the last days"—events fulfilled in Palestine. Balaam said to Balak, "And now, behold, I go unto my people: come therefore, and I will advertise thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days." Num. 24:14. This, also, has happened long ago.

Chapter 10 is introductory. In chapter 11 the explanation given is so complete an expansion of chapter 8 that one needs but insert the names of men and countries to make the prophecy read like history. That explanation was needed to make the vision fully intelligible. Those who lived in the days of its accomplishment could not mistake the meaning. Yet, notwithstanding the extreme minuteness in details, nothing was said about the days, simply because that part of the vision is self-explanatory.

Whether there is a connection between Daniel 8 and 9, we shall, for argument's sake, neither admit nor deny. We present what seems to us as a more reasonable view. The preceding vision, or visions, taken in connection with Jeremiah's prophecies, which Daniel had just been studying, may have given him wrong views respecting Israel's future. Daniel prayed earnestly for what he hoped and expected to see established after the captivity was ended. In this connec-



tion Gabriel gave him plainly to understand, that Israel's expected salvation would not come at the close of the captivity. After that another seventy weeks of years had to elapse before Messiah would come. Then the sanctuary and its service, in which he was so exceedingly much interested, would have served their purpose in the middle of the seventieth week. Also, after that the city would again be destroyed. In thought and scope, chapter 9 differs widely from the preceding vision.

"At the beginning of thy supplications," said Gabriel, "the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." Dan. 9: 23. As soon as Daniel began to unburden his mind, the command was given to give him skill and understanding. If this is an allusion to the vision of chapter 8, then Gabriel did not succeed in giving him skill and understanding, for he explained that vision very minutely at a subsequent time, as has been pointed out. But if the vision alluded to in chapter 9, be limited to the matter which was revealed at that particular time, then the difficulty vanishes.

A careful comparison reveals, furthermore, that the two periods are opposites. The 2,300 days are a period of desolation, of oppression, and of defiling the sanctuary. The 490 years begin with restoration, with a rebuilding of city and temple, and a resumption of the sanctuary service. The people were not oppressed, but found favor in the sight of heathen

monarchs. By decree, the privilege was granted them of drawing from the provincial treasury of Syria, to the amount of whatever was required for the service of the temple, to the end that the priests might daily pray for the health of the king and the prosperity of his empire. The seventy weeks began in a manner the very opposite of the 2,300 days. Hence they did not begin simultaneously.

The next noteworthy discrepancy is caused by not discriminating between the two abominations. The "transgression of desolation," spoken of in chapter 8, lasted the full period of 2,300 days, at the end of which the sanctuary *was cleansed*. The "overspreading of abominations," mentioned in chapter 9, came at the destruction of Jerusalem. By it both city and temple were destroyed, making a subsequent cleansing of the temple impossible. It is, therefore, an incontrovertible fact that the period of 2,300 days, at the end of which the temple was cleansed, falls *prior to the destruction* of Jerusalem.

To the intent that the untenableness of the theory may become still more apparent, we shall next furnish proof contradicting the assumption that the "transgression of desolation" denotes the papacy. The matter referred to, under the appellation of "abomination of desolation," or "transgression of desolation," wherever the expression occurs in the Bible, does not denote people or individuals, but things. For, when Jesus alluded to the abomination of desolation, in connection with Jerusalem's overthrow, he surely did



not mean that the Christians should flee as soon as they saw the papacy established in the city. Neither is the expression a synonym for the Roman army, although Luke 21:20 seems to favor such a view. The sign mentioned by Luke applies more particularly to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The ones who were then in the midst of it, were warned to depart, and those in the country were cautioned not to enter the city. Matthew and Mark mention the abomination, and both give its meaning only as applicable to all Judea: "then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains."

Now notice more particularly that it is a *thing*. "And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." Dan. 11:31. It is something placed: whoever took the sacrifice away, placed the abomination. Fausset defines it: "The idol of the desolator," or "the idol that causeth desolation." In "The Jewish Encyclopedia" the following definition is given: "In both Biblical and rabbinical Hebrew abomination is a familiar term for an idol (1 Kings 11:5; 2 Kings 23:13) . . . and therefore may well have the same application in Daniel, which should accordingly be rendered, in agreement with Ezra 9:3, 4, 'motionless abomination,' or, also, 'appalling abomination!'" And in James Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" the reader will find: "It is remarkable that in 1 Mac. 1:54 the idol-altar

is called by exactly the same name that is used in the book of Daniel."

The idolatrous, image-crowned Roman standards were symbols of heathen deities. To them the soldiers paid homage, and offered sacrifices in acknowledgment of victories obtained. When the legions, bearing those idol-standards, were seen, it was a warning to the inhabitants of Judea to flee to the mountains. All Jewry being familiar with the meaning of Christ's quotation, the Christians must have recognized in it, at once, an allusion to idols, or to idol-worship. The force of this statement will be better felt, if it be borne in mind that the Jews had annually, for *nearly* two hundred years, celebrated the Feast of Dedication (John 10:20), in commemoration of the cleansing of the second temple and altar, after they had been profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes. Consequently, the allusion to the abomination of desolation, spoken of in Daniel, suggested to them the idea of idols and idolatry. And harmonious with this is the marginal reading of Daniel 9:27, in the A. V., which says, "And upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator." Therefore, when the inhabitants of Judea saw idols brought within their borders, it was a sign of the impending desolation.

Nor can the 2,300 days be made to begin at the *end* of the 490 years, for a few years thereafter the sanctuary was destroyed, never to be rebuilt. Then the descendants of Israel were scattered to every point of the compass. In every particular, in short, the two



periods, laid side by side, are a mismatch. There is a misfit, because the prophecies of Daniel 8 and 9 pertain to wholly different events.

The explanation is also wrong as regards the participating agents. If the little horn represents Rome (and it certainly could not harm God's people before it came in contact with them, in 161 B. C.), then, according to the logic of the premise, the 2,300 days began to be fulfilled under people who were not Romans. For at the commencement of the weeks of years,—about three centuries before the Romans appeared upon the stage of action,—the Medes and Persians held supremacy over the Israelites. After them the Greeks held dominion, until they in turn were vanquished by the Romans. The whole theory of the periods beginning at the same starting point is a failure in every particular.

Here we call a halt. We shall stop chasing the fanciful. Not because there are no more glaring inconsistencies to be pointed out, but because those already mentioned must appeal strongly to thinking minds, and have awakened a longing for a more rational explanation of the subject. And let the reader be judge whether the following interpretation is not simpler, plainer, and exactly in harmony with events as foreshadowed by the outline of prophecy.

## PART II

In the symbolism of chapter eight, the two contending governments are represented by the appropriate figures of a ram and a he-goat. There lies a significant meaning in this representation. Instead of a diadem, the kings of Persia wore a jeweled ram's head of gold, such as are seen on the pillars at Persepolis. Also, the Hebrew for *ram* springs from the same root as Elam, or Persia (*Newton*). And in Grecian mythology Ceranus, Macedonia's first king, is said to have been advised by an oracle to follow a flock of goats to where they stopped. They led him to Edessa, which he made the seat of his kingdom, and was called Ægæ, the goats' city. Its people were likewise called Ægædæ, or goats' people.

The prophetic symbols were, therefore, chosen with due appropriateness, and correctly applied to Medo-Persia and Grecia. Verses 20, 21. Proceeding with the last-named power, the conspicuous horn of the goat was interpreted to represent Greece's first king. Verse 21. Obviously not the first king of the line that ruled over the realm, but the first one of those who, after the overthrow of Persia, thenceforward bore sway, and ruled until the overturning of the four divisions of the Grecian empire. With panoramic vividness, we behold the last struggle waged in defense of Persia's supremacy. The victor who triumphed in that fierce conflict was Alexander the Great. He was, therefore, that great and notable horn.



Briefly noticing but a few of the more salient features, we next stop to consider that the great horn was broken just when the goat had become strong. The empire was in full strength at Alexander's death. One would expect to see that colossal strength perpetuated, but prophecy indicates a different turn of affairs. Four notable horns sprang up in the place of the one broken off. "Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his [the first king, Alexander's] power." Verse 22. This is the comment of him who was commanded to make Daniel understand the vision. The correctness of this interpretation, thus far, is firmly established.

By the help of history, we find the names of Alexander's four successors to be Seleucus, Cassander, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus. In this fourfold division the empire continued to exist, until it eventually was forced to bow before the scepter of Roman supremacy. With this brief allusion to the four Grecian kingdoms, they would be dismissed from further notice, had it not been distinctly foretold that "in the latter time of their kingdom," a "little horn" was to come forth.

Now note carefully what is said. The beginning of their kingdom dates from the battle of Ipsus (301 B. C.). The history of the kingdom allotted to Cassander terminated in the year 146 B. C. The kingdom of the Seleucidæ, comprising Syria, ended in the year 64 B. C. The rule over Egypt, under the Ptole-

mies, lasted till 30 B. C. And the government over Thrace ended with the fall of the Macedonian kingdom, in 168 B. C. According to these dates, the four kingdoms continued to rule, as contemporary kings, from 301 B. C. until 168 B. C. "In the latter time of their kingdom" means, accordingly, at some time previous to the end of their contemporaneous rule. The limitation set by the prophecy calls for the appearance of the little horn a short time prior to 168 B. C.

Having located the time when, note next out of what that horn issues. "Out of one of them," namely, one of the aforementioned horns. It is not an independent horn arising among the four existing horns, but it is an excrescence, a prong, if you please, something growing out of one of the four horns. The animal, be it remembered, is the goat. At this stage of the history, that goat bears four horns, each of which represents a division of the Grecian empire. If the argument is incontrovertible thus far, it follows logically that the little horn, growing out of one of the existing horns, belongs to the goat also. Therefore the "king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences" was a Grecian king.

The little horn can not possibly mean Rome; this fact is nailed and clinched. Then to which one of the kings of Greece does the specification apply? Evidently to one of the Syrian division, for they bore rule over Israel. And who of them held the reins of government "in the latter part" of the contemporaneous reign of the four kings? Antiochus Epipha-



nes. This is not a latter-day discovery, for it was already so understood a century and a half before Christ. The proof will be furnished. We say it unhesitatingly that the prophecy applies to Antiochus, notwithstanding some one has said that "he does not fulfill the specifications in one single particular." This makes it an easy task to disprove the bald assertion, for the points of identity can very easily be established:

1. The little horn sprang out of one of the Grecian horns. Antiochus was one of the Seleucid kings.

2. He was to appear a little prior to 168 B. C. Antiochus Epiphanes reigned from 175 to 164 B. C.

3. He is called a "little horn." Bevan says that the Hebrew expression for *little* is generally supposed to mean "from smallness," or "out of smallness," hence "little." Little is, therefore, used in a derivative sense. Concurrent with this is the definition given in Davies' "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon": "From smallness, *i. e.*, prob. from small beginnings." Antiochus rose indeed "out of smallness." In his youth he was held a hostage in Rome. Can it be as easily proved that the Roman power was but a little horn when Macedon was conquered in the year 168 B. C.? Rome had then already been rising steadily for almost six centuries, and for generations had coped successfully with neighboring powers. At the time the Macedonian horn was broken off by the Roman legions, the power of Rome was much more potent, and her dominion far more extensive than that of Mace-

don. Conformably, it would have been appropriate to say that a large horn arose out of a small one, provided it would be proper to represent a victorious foreign power by a horn, and not by another beast.

4. He "waxed exceeding great." Because his greatness was not equal to any of the previous world-powers, therefore the specification is deemed to be inapplicable to Antiochus. In taking this view, a comparison with other powers is assumed. But the prophecy does not limit us to such a comparison. Antiochus himself, compared with his erstwhile humble station in life, the subsequent investment with regal power, as well as by the thereafter successfully waged campaigns, became exceedingly great. This is in agreement with the primary meaning of "little": "out of smallness" he became exceedingly great.

5. The next point of coincidence is the exact direction in which his conquests lay, viz., "toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." He undertook four campaigns against Egypt, with greater success than had any of his predecessors.—*Fausset*. 1 Mac. 3:31, 37; 6:1. And Palestine, the pleasant land, suffered most terribly under his conquests. 1 Mac. 1:21. Rome, on the other hand, waxed great to the north, the south, the east, *and the west*. Its greatest strength lay in its western hordes. To it the application is not literal.

6. "In the latter time of their [the four horns] kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full." Verse 23. Hitzig and Von Lengerke render



the clause thus: "When the sinners fill up their measure." The sinners alluded to are undoubtedly the renegade Jews who were contemporaries with Antiochus. The following historical facts, gleaned from "Post-Biblical History of the Jews," will elucidate the text:

"The Jews of that period were enchanted with the ease and freedom of the Grecian mode of life, and restive under many of the restraints and limitations of their own. Accordingly, they abandoned themselves with all the frenzy of a new excitement, from which all restraint had been withdrawn, to the license which was offered to them. The exercises of the gymnasium seem to have taken hold of their minds with the force of a fascination. The priests neglected their service at the temple to be present at those spectacles. Some of the exercises were performed naked; and it is related that many of the Jewish competitors found means to obliterate the peculiar stamp of their nationality, in order that they might not be distinguished from Greeks and other champions in the sports of the gymnasium.

"A ferment of innovation in the minds of the Judeans at that time was not unlike that which, some two thousand years later, agitated the continent of Europe after the spread of the French Revolution and its doctrines. A new and foreign standard of perfection was set up: whatever was Greek was elegant, and beautiful, and desirable; whatever was not Greek, or opposed to its predominance, was superannuated, big-

oted, contemptible. Even minds sincerely attached to Jewish faith and Jewish nationality did not altogether escape the contagion. Indeed, the desire to approximate externally as much as possible to the usages of the Greek world, without renouncing, internally, the essentials of Judaism, produced a Judeo-Grecian literature, which, in point of time, extended over nearly three centuries, and continued till the destruction of Jerusalem."

To stem this tide of revolt from God; to bridle the passion for libertinism; to neutralize the ferment of innovation, so destructive to a form of religion which suffered no change; to reinstill a new love for the religion that is neither licentious nor profligate—in short, to restore allegiance to and confidence in the revealed religion of the Eternal One, the events of that time served an admirable purpose. A well-deserved punishment was inflicted, which would have extinguished the last spark of hope, had not the star of prophecy shone brightly in that dark hour. Then the predictions presented a sublime philosophy of history. They teach that every experience of mankind, the rise and fall of nations as well as the misfortunes which befell the Jewish race, were not mere accidents, but all in accord with Jehovah's eternal and unchanging purpose. The proclamation that God is working in and through all history, that the right will ultimately triumph and faithful service be rewarded, became foundation-stones in the faith of later Judaism



and Christianity. This fact will stand out in still bolder relief as we proceed.

7. Another specification is: "And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." Fortunately, we do not have to conjecture what the meaning of this highly figurative language is. In Gabriel's explanation we are told, "And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people."

Now, fancy that these words apply to Rome. During seven centuries of growth and extensive conquests that power waxed great, even to the Jewish nation! And Rome cast some of that people and its illustrious ones to the ground, and stamped upon them! Does not such an exegesis strike you as stating things more mildly than is warranted by the history of events? When Rome did chastise the Israelites, they were "led away captive into all nations." Luke 21: 24. Not *some* of them, but *all*, and every "star" included. That the words do, on the other hand, apply literally to Antiochus Epiphanes, that once disgraced, degraded Roman vassal, who rose to the eminence of overpowering Israel, thinking minds are forced to admit.

8. According to another specification, Antiochus should "also stand up against the Prince of princes." In verse 11 the wording is: "Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host." Jehovah is Is-

rael's prince; he is also the Prince of princes. And this being a direct statement of prophecy, it may not be twisted into an indirect application. The question to be settled is, whether Rome, at any time, did "stand up against," did magnify itself, even to the One who rules over the rulers of men. Do not bring in the story of the dragon now, for it wrought indirectly through Rome, and Rome became, in turn, indirectly culpable through the Jews. The proof demanded is, whether Rome ever did stand up directly against Jehovah in demanding the homage and obedience which belong to him alone. You will search history in vain to find an affirmative answer to the question. But in applying this to Antiochus, we find that it was his fixed purpose and dominant idea to introduce into his whole realm the worship of Zeus Olympius, with whom he identified himself, and through whose worship he expected to receive divine adoration. 1 Mac. 1:52. All other forms of worship were proscribed, and exterminated with a zeal equal to fanaticism. Accordingly, the worship of Jehovah was supplanted by an idolatrous one, in which Antiochus entered as a shareholder.

He found little difficulty to introduce this idolatry in Jerusalem, on account of the aid which he received from the Hellenizing party. The sinners having "filled up their measure," as was explained under heading 5, fell readily in line with his behest. 1 Mac. 1:12. The extermination of the holy people, together with the extinction of the revealed religion and a theocracy



on earth, looked like something inevitable. Up to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews suffered nothing that can be compared with the cruelties inflicted by that insane king. All the previous powers to which Israel had been subject recognized its inalienable right to worship Jehovah. For instance, Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 4:31—), Darius the Mede (Dan. 6:27—), Cyrus (Ezra 1:2—), Artaxerxes Longimanus (Ezra 7:12—; Neh. 2:7—). Likewise did Alexander the Great. Josephus (*Ant.* XI, 8, 5), narrating the incidents of the meeting of Alexander and Israel's high priest, tells it as follows: "Jaddua met him at Gapha (Mizpeh) at a procession of priests and citizens in white. Alexander, at the sight of the linen-arrayed priests, and the high priest in blue and gold with the mitre and gold plate bearing Jehovah's name on his head, adored and embraced him; and having been shown Daniel's prophecy concerning him, he sacrificed to God in the court of the temple, and granted the Jews liberty to live according to their own laws, and freedom from tribute in sabbatical years." The aim and purpose of the prophecy of Daniel 8 was, therefore, to fortify the people of God against the wiles and attacks of their great foe, on the one hand, as well as to inspire hope when the enemy seemed to succeed in crushing everything.

9. "And by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down." Can this be applied to Rome? Let us listen to another prophecy, which unmistakably applies to Roman

times. We allude to this: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." Dan. 9:27. In the one the sacrifice was simply taken away, but restored after a certain number of days, as the record plainly states. In the other, under Roman rule, the sacrifices and oblations ceased. Ceased when? "In the midst of the week." That locates it definitely at the death of Christ, who was to cause them to cease. After that they had no more significance or value than any heathen sacrifice. And in harmony with this idea is the omission of any allusion to the temple service in connection with the Roman abomination of desolation. The record does not credit Rome with doing what was already done full thirty years before. It says simply: "And the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary."

How perfectly the prophecy respecting the taking away of the daily sacrifice and the setting up of the abomination of desolation applies to Antiochus Epiphanes, can best be told in the following extract: "Having gained control of the center of Judaism [Jerusalem] the temple was dismantled and desecrated (Dan. 11:31). With the blood of Jewish victims was mingled that of unclean animals sacrificed in despite of the Jewish law. On the site of the great altar of Jehovah was set up, in December, 168 B. C., 'the abomination of desolation,' — an altar to Olympian Zeus. Ten days later, sacrifices were instituted upon it in



which all the remaining inhabitants in Jerusalem were obliged to participate. Within the sacred precincts were soon practiced all the immoral customs so often associated in that degenerate age with a heathen shrine (1 Mac. 1:37, 54, 59; 2 Mac. 6:2-5). All sacrifice to Jehovah of course ceased. By royal decree, the observation of the Sabbath or of the sacred feasts and practising the rite of circumcision were absolutely forbidden under penalty of death. All copies of the law were destroyed. Heathen altars and temples were erected throughout Judea, and every Jew was compelled in public to sacrifice to idols swine's flesh or that of some other unclean beast, and to present conclusive evidence that he had ceased to observe the laws of his fathers (1 Mac. 1:47-49). On the occasion of the feast of Dyonesius, every one was obliged to participate, marching in procession crowned with wreaths of ivy."

10. "And the place of his [the Prince of the host's] sanctuary was cast down." In describing the devastation caused by Appollonius, who had been sent against Jerusalem to give vent to Antiochus' exasperation because the Romans had forcibly dispossessed him of Egypt's crown, Rollin has given the following testimony: "The city was afterward plundered, and set fire to in several parts, after all the rich movables had been carried off. They demolished such parts of the houses as were still standing; and, with the ruins, built a strong fort on the top of one of the hills of the city of David, opposite to the temple, which it com-

manded." And Taylor testifies: "When they [the Maccabees] came to Mount Zion, and beheld the devastation of the city and temple, they rent their clothes, and gave vent to their sorrow in loud lamentations."—*Ancient History*.

11. "And the host was given over to it [the little horn] together with the continual burnt-offering through transgression." R. V. This agrees substantially with the marginal reading of the A. V. The historical events already quoted demonstrate the justification for inflicting punishment upon apostate Israel, who were bent upon following the Greek religion and morals. But what sense is there in seeking the fulfilment of this specification in either pagan or papal Rome? Under the "pagan form" the sacrifice was not taken away on account of transgression, but because type met antitype. The sacrifices simply ceased. They would have ceased then, even if Israel had led a life ever so holy. And much more absurd is the application to the "papal form." Taken in this broader sense, the "host," or "holy people," can be applied to no others than to Christians. The prophecy is then forced to mean that the followers of Jesus Christ were given over to suffer for their *transgressions*. Let all who still believe the old view cease their talk about persecution and martyrdom and call it henceforth a righteous retribution!"

12. "And it cast down the truth to the ground." Not satisfied with interrupting the sacrificial service, he was bent upon exterminating the very knowledge



of the true God. To this end, every copy of the law that could be found was fanatically destroyed. The observance of all sacred rites and institutions was strictly forbidden under penalty of death. It was a time of struggle for supremacy; the question at issue was whether Judaism was to be merged into the semi-civilized philosophy of Greece, which the masses of Israel had studied with so much assiduity, and which had acted so powerfully upon both the faith and the morals of the people. It was a time when faith in Jehovah's might over the world-power had to be restored.

13. "And it practised and prospered." In the providence of God, he served as a corrector of apostate Israel. His insane career and extreme cruelties went unchecked, until he had served God's purpose. He prospered, until the time for cleansing the sanctuary arrived.

14. He is also described as being "a king of fierce countenance." In one of Moses' prophecies (Deut. 28: 50), God threatened to bring against Israel a nation of fierce countenance as punishment for disobedience. The qualifying words used there being identical with those of the subject under consideration, many strenuously assume that the two passages allude to the same thing. But the conclusion is a *non sequitur*. The proof is no stronger than the claim would be that two persons are but one individual because both are called fair of face. In Deuteronomy the expression applies to a *nation*; in Daniel it serves to de-

scribe one of the characteristics of a *king*. The time when that king should stand up is specifically given; namely, "In the latter part of their kingdom." Any one who has read ancient history need but be reminded of the fact that the rule of Rome did not begin in the latter time of the four Grecian kingdoms. Besides, the Roman nation was not "broken without hands" as was the "king of fierce countenance." These diversities plainly prove non-identity.

According to the rendering of Isaac Leeser (Jewish), he was "a king impudent of face, and understanding deep schemes." "A king insolent and skilled in double-dealing," as translated by Bevan. He was devoid of customary respect and courtesy. And as regards double-dealing — artifice — craft — he was a master in the art. He expressed himself in words that disguised his secret designs; his aim being only to perplex affairs for the attainment of his own ends. Read Rollin's account.

Some urge that by the expression, "understanding dark sentences," the Latin is meant, which was the language of the Romans, and it is assumed that the Jews did not understand Latin. Granting this point does not facilitate the application to the Jews, for it is the king who understands the dark sentences. On the ground of this specification no thinking person will contend that the king represents the Roman nation, for then the prophecy is forced to mean that the Latins understood Latin. Such an application is not critically deep or correct; yet it has been published in



all seriousness, because the identity of Deut. 28: 50 and Dan. 8:23 was assumed. But facts would warrant such an application to Antiochus, since he had served thirteen years as a hostage in Rome, the seat of culture and society, where Latin was spoken, and whence he came direct to institute his schemes for obtaining possession of the Syrian throne.

15. "And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power." Released from vassalage through the intervention of his brother Seleucus, who gave his only son Demetrius in exchange for him, he started to return from Rome to Syria. When he had proceeded as far as Athens, he was informed of the assassination of his brother. It was also reported to him that the usurper stood at the head of a very strong party, and that another one was forming in favor of Ptolemy. In this exigency he turned to Eumenes, king of Pergamus, and to Attalus his brother, who seated him on the throne. No proclamation, by public act, was issued, conferring on him the kingdom. He obtained it by artifice, flattering Eumenes and Attalus of Pergamus, and canvassing the Syrian people high and low, as he had seen candidates do at Rome. Livy 41, 20. He answered very correctly to the following prophetic description: "And in his [brother's] estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries."

16. And lastly, "he shall be broken without hand."

His horrible death, ascribed by the Maccabees to a special visitation of Divine punishment, will be subsequently related. Thus, every specification applies to Antiochus, without warping or friction. The unwarrantable assertion that "he does not fulfil the specifications in one single particular," is, therefore, remanded with the recommendation that it be reconsidered and corrected.

Under the ninth heading an account is given of how the sanctuary was polluted, and its service interrupted. The task now remains to prove how exactly these, too, met their fulfilment. The question asked, in verse 13 of the Masoretic text, has greatly puzzled the translators. The early copyists have evidently corrupted the reading. Besides the rendering in our version, the following is suggested by Von Lengerke: "For how long is the vision—the continual offering and the desolating iniquity—the treading down both of the sanctuary and host?" Hitzig translates it: "For how long is the vision of the daily sacrifice—to leave unchecked the horrible iniquity and to trample down sanctuary and host?" Bevan gives what he conjectures the Hebrew basis of the Septuagint may have been, and then risks the following guess: "For how long is the vision to be, while the daily sacrifice is taken away, and the iniquity set up—from the time when he shall tread down the sanctuary and the service?" Whichever may be correct, or nearly so, Daniel had already learned that the daily sacrifice was to be interrupted; his curiosity was now naturally awa-



kened to know how long that period of desolation and the reign of abomination would last.

The answer, according to the rendering of the A. V., is: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The marginal reading gives "evenings and mornings" instead of "days." Bevan remarks that the phrase *ereb boker* "must be explained according to verse 26." This explanation must be correct, seeing it expresses the meaning given to it by Gabriel. Consequently, it is not a period of so many twenty-four hours, but equivalent to successive evenings and mornings. In Genesis 1, the evening and the morning—the two periods added—constitute one day. A similar coupling of words is found in Gen. 8:22, where it is stated that "seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." In Behrmann's *Hand Kommentar zum Alten Testament* a similar instance of coupling of words is cited. He quotes the following from the poetry of Hildebrand: "*Sumaro enti wintro sehstic*," i. e., summers and winters sixty=thirty years. This view is endorsed by Ewald, Hitzig, Kuenen, Cornill, Bleek, Kayser, Delitsch, and others.

Gabriel said, "And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true." In this explanation, in which the symbols and the metaphors of the prophecy are dropped, the expression has not been changed to "day." There seems to be an express design in using the word *day*, namely, to prevent its

not

being used in a symbolic sense. If a day were really in the mind of the speaker, the word *yom* (day) would naturally have suggested itself first of all. Since it is a question respecting the continued suspension of the daily sacrifice, the words refer to the evening and the morning oblations. For this reason, the period, expressed in days, amounts to one-half as many days as there are evenings and mornings.

The next question affects the correctness of the number 2,300. In "The Sanctuary and the Twenty-three Hundred Days," by U. Smith, the following quotation is cited: "There is no number in the Bible whose genuineness is better ascertained than that of the 2,300 days. It is found in all the printed Hebrew editions, in all the MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi's collations, and in all the ancient versions, except the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, which reads 2,400, followed by Symachus, and some copies noticed by Jerome, 2,200; both evidently literal errors, in excess and defect, which compensate each other and confirm the mean, 2,300."—*Dr. Hales.*

We confess an inability to see how the correctness is proved by the learned Doctor. Majorities can never really settle a disputed point. And if the Masoretic text plus many other Hebrew MSS. settle a point conclusively, then it must be conceded that our version of Ex. 12:40 is the correct one, notwithstanding the Septuagint renders it thus: "The sojourning of the children and of their fathers in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt was four hundred and thirty



years." Upon the strength of this reading, and other historical facts, commentators do not hesitate to ignore the testimony of the majority to the contrary. Majorities fail to prove anything, unless they prove the truth.

According to the evidence submitted, the ancient MSS. differ. A board of review, appointed in this day and age of the world, can not go back of their returns, to settle the correctness of either the 2,400, the 2,300, or the 2,200. There is, however, a way of settling the question conclusively. Let history—the fulfilled prophecy—settle for us which one of the three is entitled to be regarded as the true reading. No one can object to the fairness of this test. Its correctness is absolute.

The cleansing of the sanctuary clearly denotes the end of the period. From the wording of Dan. 8:13 we can not determine so very accurately with what it begins, because translators find the wording hazy, as has been shown. Therefore we turn to another scripture which applies to the same events. In Dan. 11:31 it is plainly stated: "And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." From these pollutions the sanctuary was cleansed; the time of their occurrence therefore constitutes the beginning of the period. Newton and his followers branch off at verse 30, and apply what follows to Rome. But their conclusion is not in harmony with the specification, for the

narrative flows without interruption in the line of Grecian history; besides, the taking away of the daily sacrifice is not chargeable to Roman conduct, inasmuch as Christ, under Rome's dominion, caused them to cease.

How long a space of time, then, lies between the two points? How many evening and morning oblations were omitted? History furnishes us the following information regarding the initial date: "On the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the one hundred forty and fifth year [of the Selucid era, or the year 168 B. C.], they set up the *abomination of desolation* on the altar." 1 Mac. 1:54. In other words, an idol altar and image of Jupiter Olympius was erected upon the altar of burnt-offerings. This stopped the offering of Jewish sacrifices. And ten days later, namely on the twenty-fifth day of the same month, the sacrifices to Jupiter began. On that date, too, the sanctuary was polluted by being sprinkled with a broth of swine's flesh.

In 1 Mac. 4:52-54 the exact year, month, and day are given, when the temple service was resumed. It is described in the following language: "Now on the five and twentieth day of the ninth month, which is called the month Casleu, in the hundred forty and eighth year [165 B. C.] they rose up betimes in the morning, and offered sacrifice according to the law upon the new altar of burnt-offerings, which they had made. Look, at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it, even in that was it dedicated



with songs, and citherns, and harps, and cymbals.” Josephus’ remarks on this period are couched in these words: “This desolation happened to the temple in the hundred forty and fifth year, on the twenty-fifth day of the month Apelleus, and on the hundred fifty and third olympiad; but it was dedicated anew, on the same day, the twenty-fifth of the month Apelleus, on the hundred and forty-eighth year, and on the hundred and fifty-fourth olympiad. And this desolation came to pass according to the prophecy of Daniel, which was given four hundred and eight years before; for he declared that the Macedonians [a name also denoting the Greeks] would dissolve the worship [for some time].” Ant. XII, 7, 6. In another place he says: “And that from among them [the four horns] there should arise a certain king that should overcome our nation and their laws, and should take away their political government, and should spoil the temple, and forbid the sacrifices to be offered for three years’ time. And indeed it so came to pass, that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel’s vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass.”—*Antiquities* X, 11, 7. Josephus failed to make mention of the ten days. The full period lasted three years and ten days.

The Jews did not reckon time in an arbitrary way. The Lord had ordained each new moon to be the beginning of a new month, which was announced, at the temple, by the blowing of trumpets, and solemnized by offering special sacrifices. Their beginning

was not established by astronomical calculations, but by the testimony of watchers, appointed to watch for the first appearance of the new moon; and then the fact was signaled abroad through the land by kindling fires upon elevated locations. Their months were, therefore, lunar months of  $29\frac{1}{2}$  days' duration; or, one month contained but 29 days and the next one 30. In twelve such months there were but 354 days. These fell short of being a solar year. The shortage was partially remedied at the end of every third year by intercalating a thirteenth month. Hence there were in a period of three years  $3 \times 354 = 1,062$ , plus  $29 = 1,091$  days.

But the period being ten days longer than 1,091 days, the full duration was  $1,091 + 10 = 1,101$  days. This includes the twenty-fifth day of the month Cas-leu, on which the daily sacrifices were resumed. The exact length from the beginning up to the end of the period is, therefore, exactly 1,100 days, or 2,200 evenings and mornings. This proves the correct reading of the text to be: "Unto two thousand and two hundred evenings and mornings, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Keunen, too,—"*Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek*,"—follows the trail with precision. His reasons for the terminal points are well grounded. Briefly stated, he says: "In verse 13 the period is plainly named, during which the daily sacrifices were to cease, the horrible iniquity set up, and sanctuary and host to remain trodden under foot; and just as plainly is the 'justi-



fiction' of the sanctuary named in verse 14 as the *terminus ad quem* [terminus to which]. For this reason, too, we prefer the theory of Bleek. Between the desecration and the cleansing of the temple there lay (1 Mac. 1:54; 4:52) exactly three years; or, if the first be reckoned from the fifteenth of Casleu, three years and ten days, *i. e.*,  $3 \times 354 + 30$  [29] for a *mensis intercalaris* =  $1,092 + 10 = 1,102$  days. Consequently forty-eight less than are required." This is on the assumption that 2,300 is the correct reading. Had he computed the time a little more accurately and taken 2,200 as the correct reading, he, too, would have solved the problem with the utmost precision.

To bring the foregoing calculations wholly within the pale of certainty, the following additional proof of an impartial and unbiased critic is submitted. Dissertation IV of the Appendix to Whiston's "Josephus" is devoted to a consideration of what copy of the Old Testament served as the authentic record upon which Josephus relied in writing his "Antiquities." "That Josephus' copy," says Whiston, "was not a little different from the Samaritan and Septuagint copies, as they stood in his age, and much more from the Masorete copy, as it has been since the days of Barchocab, is most evident. That his copy was, generally speaking, more perfect and authentic than those other copies, will certainly appear by a critical comparison of them all along; and has been frequently observed and proved in my Essay toward restoring the true text of the Old Testament, and in my Sup-

plement to the Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies." What copy Josephus had we can best tell by quoting his very words anent this point. "Titus Cæsar," thus reads his own account, "when the city of Jerusalem was taken by force, persuaded me frequently to take whatever I pleased out of the ruins of my country; for he told me that he gave me leave so to do. But there being nothing that I much valued, now my country was destroyed, I only asked of Titus liberty for myself and my family, as the only comfort now remaining in my calamities; *I also had the holy books by his concession.*" From this testimony it is plain that Josephus had the authentic copy of the Old Testament found in the temple. And the following instances prove that he quoted from the Scriptures "laid up in the temple"; namely, his narrative relating the miracle of the water flowing out of the rock, and of the sun's standing still. *Antiq.*, Bk. III, ch. 1, sec 7; Bk. V, ch. 1, sec. 17.

After a long dissertation upon the authenticity of that copy, in which many examples of proofs are cited, Whiston finally, in the closing paragraph, comes to the admission which is so very pertinent to the point under consideration. He gives the reason why Josephus, in his "Antiquities," corrected inaccuracies found in his "Wars of the Jews," and "honestly owns, with the original authors of the two books of the *Macca-bees*, that such profanation [of the temple] continued but three years only; which last is also, I think, a remarkable application of Daniel's prophecies, I mean



that of the one thousand one hundred evenings and one thousand one hundred mornings, two thousand two hundred in all, Dan. 8:14, which seems to have been the number in Josephus' copy, as Jerome says some would have it in his time; instead of those two thousand three hundred in our Masorete Hebrew, in Clem. Alex. in Africanus, in the MS. Alex., and those two thousand four hundred in our Vatican copy." Thus our explanation stands approved not only by history, but also supported by authority before which later copies must bow.

But very little has been said about the treading under foot of the host. For a detailed account of their sufferings, the reader is referred to the history of the Maccabees. In Heb. 11:34-38 an undoubted allusion to their martyrdom is also found. The forsakers of the holy covenant, who had imbibed the Greek notion that all religions are equally good for keeping the masses in check, eventually experienced the falsity of the theory, to their sorrow.

The prominence given to Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel is because it was the turning-point in Jewish history, deciding whether Greek worldly refinement was to stifle Israel's true faith. "Persecution was God's appointed way to save his people from seductions which had well-nigh made them compromise their witness for the truth."—*Fausset*. And Milman testifies on this wise: "As a last insult the feasts of the Bacchanalia, the license of which, as they were celebrated in the later days of Greece, shocked the

severe virtue of the older Romans, were substituted for the national festival of Tabernacles. The reluctant [pious] Jews were forced to join in these riotous orgies and carry the ivy, the insignia of the god. So near was the Jewish nation and the worship of Jehovah to total extermination.”—*History of the Jews*.

Antiochus was the unconscious instrument in God's hand to scourge them back onto the path of faith and rectitude. The savage and insane violence of this tyrant was, in fact,—and surely we may say proverbially,—the safeguard of the Jews against the greatest moral danger to which they had ever been exposed: the slow and insidious, but certain and destructive, advance of indifference to religious truth, evinced by encroachments and gradual prevalence of Grecian manners, Grecian corruption, Grecian idolatry, and Grecian atheism.

His fanatacism aroused the dormant energies of the whole Jewish people, so that the zealous attachment to the law and the truth of the Lord, united with the generous desire for national independence, gave a tone of exaltation to the character of the people, and evoked enthusiasm, a courage, both active and passive, which set at defiance the utmost power of Antiochus, and which then, and ever since, in the stern hour of trial, has animated and sustained the Jews to such an extent that it has, in fact, rendered them imperishable.

“Had they basely yielded to Antiochus,”—we quote again from “Post-Biblical History of the Jews”—“they



might have escaped the ill inflicted upon them; they might, like the other inhabitants of geographical Syria, have merged into a nationality so contemptible, that, in the Greek and Roman plays, the word "slave" and "Syrian" were synonymous; and that, even before the war which crushed Syria, the Roman Consul T. Q. Flaminius, in reply to a pompous harangue of the ambassadors of Antiochus the Great before the Greek National Assembly at Ægium (192 B. C.) could take upon himself to declare that 'the vile name of Syrian comprehended every form of baseness, vice, and servility.' Plutarch, in Flamin, and Tit. Liv. lxxxv. cap. 49.

"With this corrupt, effeminate, and base, but elegant, highly polished and pleasure-loving nationality the Jews might have been amalgamated. But what would have been the consequence to them? Like those base Syrians, they would have been swept from the face of the earth; their identity would have been at an end; their national existence obliterated; their influence in the destinies of mankind gone forever. The sacred mission, however, that had been entrusted to them did not permit so miserable a consummation to their wondrous history; the high and holy truth of which they were the guardians and witnesses forbade so ridiculous a downfall of their lofty aspiration.

"As the Jews were the only people to whom, nationally, a positive religion had been revealed, the dogmas of which excluded all worship but that of

God alone, while all around them pantheism and idolatry, with their ever-shifting mythology, prevailed, the Jews, among all various religious systems, were the first to make a stand in defense of their faith. Theirs was the glory of being first called upon to uphold the truth of their belief at the price of life, and to seal their conviction with their heart's best blood. But as they were the first martyrs persecuted for conscience' sake, so they were likewise the first champions in the cause of religious liberty. The Greek who conquered at Marathon fought for national independence; the Romans who expelled Tarquin gained a triumph for civil liberty; but the handful of Jews who, under Judas Maccabeus and his brothers, drew the sword against the overwhelming power of Antiochus and his successors, made their stand for religious freedom and the rights of conscience."

We owe yet a more specific account of how he was literally "broken without hands," as well as when the host ceased to be trodden under foot. And this being a matter purely historical, we shall quote, on this point, from M. J. Raphael's "History of the Jews." The following will elucidate the last-named specification: "With the reopening of the temple at Jerusalem, and the public observance of the Jewish religion throughout the land, the actual rule of the Syro-Grecian kings over Judea may be said to have terminated. For though the war between the province of Judea and the empire of Syria continued many years longer; though the successors of Antiochus al-



ways claimed and often exercised power and sovereignty over Palestine, and the Jews themselves did not proclaim their independence till nearly a quarter of a century later, yet, from the moment Judas Macabeus took possession of Jerusalem, he and after him his brothers became *de facto* rulers of the land. He and they were at the head of the armed force; he and they conducted the internal administration and the foreign policy of Judea; he and they treated with the kings of Syria as an independent power against another independent power, and entered into treaties of alliance with foreign governments, without the sanction, and contrary to the will, of these kings, whose authority in Judea extended no farther than the spot momentarily held by their army, and ceased altogether as soon as that army was forced to retreat."

And regarding the death of the oppressor, he gives the following description: "In an attempt on the temple of Jupiter, at Elymais, he first learned of the repeated discomfitures and routs of his army in Judea—tidings which exasperated to fury the wounds which his pride had received at Elymais. Transported with ungovernable passion, he swore, in the excess of his rage, that utter destruction should be the lot of the Jews, and that Palestine should become their grave. While he urged the march of his troops westward with the utmost precipitation, the immoderate quantities of wine, which he unceasingly swallowed, caused him to be attacked with a painful and

incurable disease of the intestines. Yet on he went, his mouth, amid deep curses, uttering the fell purpose of his heart, till, in his reckless haste, his chariot was upset. He was thrown out and much hurt; and the foul and diseased state of his body, acting upon his wounds, caused them to breed vermin, and to emit so pestiferous a smell that his attendants dared not approach him. In this loathsome and horrible condition, he died at the obscure village of Tabœ, situated near the extremity of Mt. Zagros, on the road to Babylon" (164 B. C.). For other particulars see 2 Mac. 9.

The explanation has, necessarily, been made as brief as possible. The historical evidence adduced is but fragmentary. Yet the way is blazed; with the requisite historical material at hand, it is an easy matter to swell the details to any desired degree of fullness. And as regards the historical evidence, there is a great plenty of it. For several of the quotations presented we are indebted to authorities found in the Chicago Public Library, which contains many volumes on Jewish history. Whoever desires to delve deeper into the study of this subject can find there a vast amount of material that is readily accessible.

At the close of his history of Antiochus Epiphanes, Rollin presents the following testimony relative to the subject under consideration: "No prophecy," he says, "was ever fulfilled in so clear, so perfect, and so indisputable a manner as this. Porphyry, the professed



enemy of the Christian religion, as well as of the Old and the New Testament, being infinitely perplexed in finding so great a conformity between the events foretold by Daniel, and the relations given by the best historians, did not pretend to deny this conformity; for that would have been repugnant to sense, and denying the shining of the sun at noonday. However, he took another course in order to undermine the authority of the Scriptures. He himself labored, by citing all the historians extant at that time, and which are since lost, to show, in a very extensive manner, that whatever is written in the eleventh chapter of Daniel, happened exactly as foretold by the prophet; and he concluded from this perfect uniformity that so exact a detail of so great a number of events could not possibly have been written by Daniel so many years before they happened; and that this work must certainly have been written by some person who lived after Antiochus Epiphanes, and borrowed Daniel's name."

Think of a fulfillment so complete and convincing that an able enemy of Christianity did not pretend to deny the conformity to the prophecy, but even lent assistance in proving the correctness of the application. And then think of the would-be interpreters of the same prophecy, who, in modern times, have invented crude interpretations that are "repugnant to the sense" of historically enlightened minds. They either ignorantly or else deliberately repudiate the long array of evidence which forced Porphyry to shield behind the transparent subterfuge, that the

prophecy was but mere history. How easily they might have helped him out of his dilemma by merely dropping the suggestion that the little horn represents "pagan Rome" and "papal Rome"! We fancy that he would have dismissed them with the counsel to school themselves more thoroughly in history, before they again attempted to stand up as expounders of the plainly fulfilled word.

Misapplied prophecy unavoidably brings disappointment in the end. Perforce this inexorable law, thousands were disappointed in 1844. The few who then survived the shipwreck of faith, revised their creed to suit the exigency of the case. Nevertheless, the expedient proved to be but an abortive attempt in constructing a theory that will harmonize with the terms of the prophecy. Even in its latest, up-to-date, remodeled form it can not yet stand the test of sound, scriptural criticism. The fact of the matter is, it is an utter impossibility to harmonize the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary with a prophecy dealing with the pollution and the cleansing of the Jewish temple. It lacks the "eternal fitness" of things.

In a modified form Miller's theory is still believed. During full seventy years it has been believed that the sanctuary was to be cleansed at the end of the 2,300 years. The time is not far distant when the numerical reading of the Septuagint will be accepted as the correct one. This is neither a bold assertion nor a prophetic guess, for the shrewder ones already admit that we are, at this very day and hour, much



nearer the 2,400 than the 2,300 mark. The idea has received favorable consideration. And why should it not, seeing they allow ample time for it since the present slogan is, "The gospel to all the world in this generation."

All correctly interpreted prophecy affixes the seal of confirmation to the vision, and begets a stronger confidence in every other word of God. When "thus it is written," and "thus it behooved" can be laid side by side, the demonstration is incontrovertible. It is proof that begets conviction. But such futile attempts as have been assailed, beget distrust and unbelief. Quite a while may intervene between the sowing and the reaping, nevertheless the harvest will follow after the seedtime. Accordingly, it is an open secret that very many "veterans of the cause" have lost their former conviction. Hundreds of others have slipped their anchors, and are now, like derelicts upon the ocean, drifting toward destruction. They are threatened with disbelief in God and his revealed religion.

Aside from correcting mistaken ideas, it is our aim, in writing this, to inspire confidence in the utmost reliability of the prophetic word. Prophecy is a sure word, and we are admonished to give heed to it, as unto a light shining in a dark place. It is given for guidance through the dark mazes of life's labyrinth. But that light misinterpreted becomes a menace to safety. The beacons lit along the coast serve to guide the mariner into the desired haven. Yet, when the color or the flashes of those lights are mis-

taken for those placed at other locations, the rocks and shoals are not looked for in their proper places; and thus the very lights may cause destruction. On the other hand, when prophecy is correctly interpreted, its guidance is absolutely safe. But when its meaning is misconstrued, people wrest it, like any other portion of Scripture, to their own detriment or destruction.

At first glance, the foregoing explanation of Daniel 8 may seem to undermine the belief in the nearness of the Lord's coming. If any one's belief is built upon that prophecy, then the interpretation tends to undermine his belief. This is freely and frankly admitted. We do not desire to be misunderstood. We have striven to prove that that prophecy *does not contain the remotest allusion to our Saviour or to his mediatorial work*. Thousands of firm believers in the doctrine of the advent have never even so much as dreamed of proving their faith by that prophecy. It would never have been used to prove the proximity of that event, if Wm. Miller and his colaborers had but taken the pains to test his interpretation by historical evidence. As it turned out—and it logically could not turn out otherwise—his application was wrong as to event, nature, and time. His theory should have been rejected then and there, because it failed to stand the test. It stood condemned, even before it went to trial, for "of that day and that hour knoweth no man." Nevertheless, thousands believed



him, rather than God's caution. Their disappointment is, therefore, not chargeable to the Lord.

To err is human, to acknowledge an error requires more than the average amount of courage; and to point out an error is a thankless task. Some misconstrue the motive, with others the paramount question is, Who said it? or Who believes it? A very few weigh the evidence with the least, or with no, prejudice.

The world of to-day lives in expectancy, as did they who saw Messiah's "star in the east," at the time of his first advent. Christians, whose thoughts are not wholly engrossed with the cares of this life, or bent on seeking the pleasures of the world, perceive the shadows of coming events. Devout men and women are interpreting the signs of the times, which presage the ushering in of another day. The mission fields are white, and waiting for the sickle to be thrust in. The proclamation of the gospel is already heard in all lands. Hundreds of missionaries feel constrained to work like men who rescue others from a sinking ship. These, as well as other signs, betoken that the Spirit leads where the definite (numerically expressed) guidance of prophecy fails. Let us all see to it, then, that we are amenable to his guidance; let us listen to his whispers; for then shall we read the signs aright, and not be found without oil in our lamps when the Bridegroom comes.